

REMARKS

Status of case

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-14 are currently pending in this case.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to because of informalities using the misspelled word “sever” instead of “server.” Applicant amends claim 1 where it is believed appropriate.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Takushi (JP11271582A) in view of Beyda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,850).

Applicants present amended claims 1, 6, and 11. Specifically, claim 1 recites the following:

a storing step of storing the type information in a memory of the communications terminal;

a generating step of generating, by the communication terminal upon receipt of an arrival notice from the server apparatus, a request for the email destined for the communication terminal, the request including data indicating the type information stored in the memory;

a sending step of sending the request that includes the data indicating the type information to said server apparatus from the communications terminal;

See also claim 6 (“a memory that stores the obtained type information”; “a generating means for generating, upon receipt of an arrival notice from said server apparatus, a request for an e-mail destined for the communication terminal, the request including data indicating the type information stored in the memory” and “a transmitting means for transmitting the generated request that includes the data indicating the type information to a server apparatus”); claim 11 (“means for transmitting an arrival notice to a communications terminal upon receipt of an email destined for the communications terminal”, “means for receiving from a communications terminal a request requesting an e-mail destined for the communications terminal, the request including data indicating type information that identifies a type of an attachment file a user of the communications terminal desires to receive” and “means for determining whether a type of an

attachment file of the e-mail, which is destined for the communications terminal and received by the server apparatus, is identical to a type extracted from the information indicating the type information”). Applicants respectfully contend that the references, even if combined, do not teach the above-cited limitations.

Specifically, the Takushi reference teaches transmitting information relating to the capability of an attachment file that can be handled by a user terminal. See paragraphs [0013], [0016-0018], [0021], [0034], [0036], [0039]-[0042], and [0045]. However, the Takushi reference fails to teach: (1) storing the type information in a memory of the communication terminal (which is input by a user of the communication terminal); or (2) generating, upon receipt of an arrival notice from the server, a request that includes the type information stored in the memory.


Similarly, the Beyda reference teaches a terminal capable of filtering e-mails. When the terminal in Beyda accesses the server to obtain an e-mail for the terminal, the terminal searches a mail box for the terminal and determines whether an e-mail stored in the mail box fulfills predetermined conditions (such as file format, file size, and file type). See Abstract, col. 6, lines 50-62; see also Figs. 2-3. As is clear, the Beyda reference fails to teach or even suggest any generating of a request that is sent from the communication terminal to the server that includes the type information that identifies a type of an attachment file that a user of the communications terminal desires to receive.

In contrast and as claimed in claims 1, 6, and 11, the type information is stored in the communication terminal. In this way, a user of the communication terminal is able to rewrite or update the type information. Moreover, since the communication terminal automatically generates the request and sends the request to the server upon receipt of an arrival notice from said server apparatus, the communication terminal may simply receive the e-mail from the server without requiring the server additional (and costly) processing. Specifically, since the communication terminal sends the type information in the request to the server, the server may forgo searching and filtering e-mails for the communication terminal. As a result, the time required for the communication terminal to access the server is reduced, thereby reducing the uplink traffic of the communication network. This is particularly advantageous, given that a communication network is typically configured such that the bandwidth of the downlink communication is greater than that of the uplink communication. Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that the claims as currently presented distinguish over the cited art.

SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully requests early allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorneys for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Amir N. Penn
Registration No. 40,767
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200